UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,640	12/01/2004	Robert E Click	082734-0113	6993
23524 FOLEY & LAR	7590 06/18/200 RDNER LLP	EXAMINER		
150 EAST GILL		MACAULEY, SHERIDAN R		
	P.O. BOX 1497 MADISON, WI 53701-1497			PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/516,640	CLICK, ROBERT E					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	SHERIDAN R. MACAULEY	1651					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vor Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 So</u>	entember 2007						
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
<u> </u>	,—						
. —	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
·	.x parto Quayro, 1000 0. 5 . 11, 10	0.0.210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> are subject to restriction and/or	8) Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.05(a).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite					

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-7, drawn to a composition comprising an isolated bacterium.

Group II, claim(s) 8-10, drawn to a method of treating Johne's disease.

Group III, claim(s) 11-12, drawn to a composition comprising a pharmacologically active dose of an isolated bacterium, an active fragment thereof, a protein secreted therefrom, or combinations thereof.

Group IV, claim(s) 13-15, drawn to a method of treating Johne's disease.

Group V, claim(s) 16-17, drawn to a feed composition.

Group VI, claim(s) 19-20, drawn to a method of treating Johne's disease.

Group VII, claim(s) 21-22, drawn to a feed additive.

Group VIII, claim(s) 23-25, drawn to a method of treating Johne's disease.

Group IX, claim(s) 26, drawn to a composition comprising a pharmacologically active dose of a bacterium, an active fragment thereof, a protein secreted therefrom, or combinations thereof.

Group X, claim(s) 27-29, drawn to a method of treating a disease or syndrome.

Group XI, claim(s) 30, drawn to a method of culturing a bacteria.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I through XI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the

same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical feature that is common to all of the groups is a bacterium of the genus *Dietzia* or some component thereof. However, bacteria of the genus *Dietzia* were known in the art at the time of the invention, as taught by Rainey et al. (International Journal of Systematic Bacteriology, 1995, 45:32-36; document cited in IDS). Therefore, there is not special technical feature that makes a contribution over the prior art.

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

For Groups III, IV, IX and X, election is required of the various species of components to the composition recited in claims 11 and 26. Applicant may elect bacteria of the genus *Dietzia*, an active fragment thereof, a protein secreted therefrom, or some specific combination thereof.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

4. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the manner set forth above.

No claim(s) are generic.

5. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical feature that is common to all of the groups is a bacterium of the genus *Dietzia* or some component thereof. However, bacteria of the genus *Dietzia* were known in the art at the time of the invention, as taught by Rainey et al. (International Journal of Systematic Bacteriology, 1995, 45:32-36; document cited in IDS). Therefore, there is not special technical feature that makes a contribution over the prior art.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Application/Control Number: 10/516,640

Page 5

Art Unit: 1651

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHERIDAN R. MACAULEY whose telephone number is (571)270-3056. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 7:30AM-5:00PM EST, alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/516,640 Page 6

Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leon B Lankford Jr/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651

SRM